

REMARKS

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-16, 18-46 and 48-56 are pending in this application. Claims 18,19 and 48-54 have been objected to for relying upon a deleted base claim. Claims 1-16, 18-46 and 48-56 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,771 to Irwin et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,779 to Putnins et al. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are, therefore, traversed.
2. Claims 18,19 and 48-54 have been objected to for depending upon a deleted base claim. In response, the dependency has been corrected.
3. Claims 1-16, 18-46 and 48-56 have been rejected as being obvious over Irwin et al. in view of Putnins et al. In response, independent claims 1, 16, 35 and 45 have been further limited to "determining whether the exchanged information in each successive slot should be compressed or decompressed based upon a status of specific bit locations of the respective address data for the exchanged information". Support for the additional limitation may be found at numerous locations throughout the specification (e.g., page 15, lines 5-16).

It is noted in this regard, that Irwin et al. does not contain any teaching regarding compression. Putnins et al.

is directed to compression, but does not differentiate among slots with regard to compression.

For example, Putnins et al. explicitly states that "all voice messages directed to a predetermined remote node are assigned a predetermined compression level" (Putnins et al., col. 2, lines 34-36). Since all voice messages directed to each remote site under Putnins et al. has the same predetermined level of compression, there would not be any "determining whether the exchanged information in each successive slot should be compressed or decompressed based upon a status of specific bit locations of the respective address data for the exchanged information". Since the combination of Irwin et al. and Putnins et al. would lack this element, any rejection based upon the combination would now be improper.

4. Allowance of claims 1-16, 18-46 and 48-56, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 
Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

October 22, 2003
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500